

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-19, 21-25, 27-36, 38, 40-45, 47-56, 58, and 60 are pending in this application. Claims 5, 20, 26, 39, 46, and 59 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 16, 37, and 57 have been canceled. In this Response, Applicants have amended certain claims in this response because Applicants believe these amendments serve a useful clarification purpose, and are desirable for clarification purposes, independent of patentability. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments do not limit the range of any permissible equivalents.

In particular, the independent claims have been rewritten to incorporate subject matter previously recited in now canceled dependent claims. In addition, claims 8, 29, and 49 have been amended to clarify the invention. As no new matter has been added by the amendments herein, Applicants respectfully request entry of these amendments at this time.

### **ELECTIONS / RESTRICTIONS**

With regard to the indication of finality of the species election requirement, Applicants understand that upon allowance of a generic claim, the claims of the non-elected species can be included in the application if written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim.

### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 16, 37, and 57. In response, claims 1, 22, and 41 have been rewritten to incorporate the subject matter previously recited in claims 16, 37, and 57.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 8, 17, 29, 38, 49, and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. In response, Applicants have amended claims 8, 29, and 49 to clarify the claim language of concern to the Examiner. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the § 112 rejection of these claims are overcome and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal thereof.

With respect to the § 112 rejection of claims 17, 38, and 58, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the independent claims and the cancellation of claims 16, 37, and 57 overcome this rejection. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal thereof.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-15, 18-19, 21-25, 27-33, 35-36, 40-45, 47-53, 55-56, and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,299,550 to Molitor for the reasons provided on page 4 of the Office Action. In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 13, 34, and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Molitor as set forth on page 4 of the Office Action. As recognized by the Examiner, Molitor does not disclose a halogenated thiophenol in any of the "shell" layers, as now recited in the independent claims. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections of the pending claims.


### **CONCLUSION**

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the present amendments still do not resolve all of the issues regarding patentability of the pending claims, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorneys to discuss any remaining issues.

A Petition for an Extension of Time is submitted herewith to extend the time for response one month to and including September 18, 2005. No other fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any additional fee be required, however, please charge such fee to Swidler Berlin LLP Deposit Account No. 195127, Order No. 20002.0339.

Respectfully submitted,  
SWIDLER BERLIN LLP

Dated: September 19, 2005

By:   
Stephanie D. Scruggs, Registration No. 54,432  
SWIDLER BERLIN LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20007  
(202) 424-7755 Telephone  
(202) 295-8478 Facsimile